

REMARKS

Claim 38 has been amended to correct a spelling error in the third to the last line and also to add the subject matter that the associated data object identifier is automatically generated using information stored in the data object so that the identifier is dependent on the content of the data object. This addition is based on Applicants' specification disclosure at paragraph 19 disclosing this automatic generation and at paragraph 0015 disclosing that the data object identifier is dependent on the content of the data object. Therefore there is no new matter involved in this claim amendment.

Claim 38 was also amended to recite that the separate data object category store associates the data object identifiers with access right categories so that access rights can thereby be determined from the data object itself. This Amendment is based on the specification disclosure of paragraph 0015 that access rights can be determined from the data object itself. There is therefore no new matter involved in this claim amendment.

The Examiner rejects claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Marchosky in view of Hotchkiss.

Claim 38 first distinguishes at least by reciting that the electronic data object has an associated data object identifier which is automatically generated using information stored in the data object so that the identifier is dependent on the content of the data object. The Examiner relies on the records 112 in Figure 1 of Marchosky along with the abstract and paragraphs 0002, 0004, 0021-0022, 0054, and 0086. However, these citations only discuss the patient data records but nowhere disclose an associated data object identifier which is automatically generated dependent on the content of the data object. It is noted in particular that paragraph 0054 discloses

that each record includes one or more sectors or medical information and each sector includes individual and independent units, and that the system 100 provides correlative activity between parts of the individual and independent units in a controlled manner with access to information and each unit being limited to authorized individuals. This is clearly not a disclosure of the recited associated data object identifier which is automatically generated using information stored in the data object so that the identifier is dependent on the content of the data object.

Claim 38 next distinguishes at least by reciting providing a separate data object category store for association of the data object identifiers with access right categories so that access rights can thereby be determined from the data object itself. For the data object category store, the Examiner cites the same paragraphs of Marchosky discussed above. In the disclosures other than paragraph 0054 it is merely disclosed that the patient himself allows or disallows access rights in relation to his medical records. That is clearly not a disclosure of associating the data object identifiers, which are generated automatically from the data object itself, with access rights categories. And as to paragraph 0054, although this appears to disclose that access to information in each sector unit is limited to authorized individuals, this is clearly not a disclosure that the automatically generated data object identifiers are associated with access right categories so that access rights can thereby be determined from the data object itself. Rather the patient is determining in paragraph 0054 for different sectors or units of his patient file whether access to that specific information in each unit is limited to authorized individuals.

The Examiner also cites Hotchkiss for the separate data object category store for association of data object identifiers with access right categories and in particular cites the abstract, and paragraphs 0066, 0013-0149, 0169, 0209, and 0219.

Hotchkiss there teaches that the data access privileges are defined by the roles where those roles in turn are defined by the administrator (see paragraph 91 in Hotchkiss). Thus in accordance with Hotchkiss the access rights are not deducible by the content of the data object itself as recited by claim 38. With the recited invention in claim 38, there is the benefit as pointed out in paragraphs 15 and 20 that it is sufficient to generate the data object identifier in the data object so that then the data object identifier only has to be read out from the data object which reduces the possibility for manipulation.

Hotchkiss discusses roles at paragraphs 139 and 141. The study administrator is responsible for creating a role for a specific study and a role consists of a collection of capabilities and data set permissions. The study administrator may create the role name and the associated capabilities and data permission that is appropriate. When a role is assigned to a user as specified in paragraph 0141, the user will be given or not given this level of access to the data sets specified by the study administrator in the role. But this is clearly not a disclosure of associated data object identifiers being automatically generated using information stored in the data object identifier so that the identifier is dependent on the content of the data object and wherein the separate data object category store associates the data object identifier with the access right category so that access rights can thereby be determined from the data object itself. In Hotchkiss, rather the administrator is defining access.

Allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or to credit any overpayment to account No. 501519.

Respectfully submitted,


Brett A. Valiquet (Reg. No. 27,841)

Brett A. Valiquet
Schiff Hardin LLP
Patent Department
6600 Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: (312) 258-5786
Attorneys for Applicants.
CUSTOMER NO. 26574

CH2\7389095.1